

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DD/S 66 -3237

Approved For Release 2003/04/29 : CIA-RDP84-00780R001300060020-2

21 JUN 1966

DD/S 66 -3237

FILED C-112-4 (EDP)

MEMORANDUM FOR: Special Assistant to the Deputy Director for Support

Bob:

1. Though I am going to disagree with your recommendations of 16 June regarding three requests for computer services generated by [] for reasons which I will cover below, let me say that I share your concern with the problem of random development of a system, the need to establish relative priorities, and most importantly of all the unreliability of various input reporting. Having joined you in principle, permit me now to disagree in specifics. I have just learned from Chuck Briggs that additional capacity is going to be added to the 501 as an interim measure and that machine time is also being contracted for outside. I recognize that hardware is only part of the problem and, indeed, that programming backlog is our greatest concern at the moment. Nonetheless, I feel that we would be most remiss in not going ahead with these pieces.

25X1

2. In regard to dependent information -- we have in this qualifications questionnaire exercise a present opportunity to update our files and provide a base against which an improvement in the interim reporting system could act. Further, to be totally realistic -- annual updating is better than none at all; and I see no evidence that the immediate future will produce a disciplined status reporting system which would provide what you ask. Lord knows we need it, but nobody is working on it now; and it may very well not come until you and your group have finished your current project.

3. As to the two work orders regarding the language training record, I feel we have no choice. As you know, I am the DDS representative on the Language Committee as well as [] immediate boss; and as a result have been very close to the problems of valid recordation of language proficiency, the disclaimers, and the slow response to the testing requirement. But these are, indeed, separate problems from having in the computer what solid data there are. I am today reminding the DDS of the requirement that position language requirements be identified by 1 July. I am not so sanguine as to think that these will all be in by 1 July and, indeed, I fear that it will be at least the end of the year before the totality of the Agency's position language requirements are collected. I am not prepared to tell the command that we haven't put the hard language data in the machine because requirements have not been codified. (We continually receive requests

25X1

Approved For Release 2003/04/29 : CIA-RDP84-00780R001300060020-2

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

for various kinds of language information which can be satisfied by the language rosters.) I even see the possibility that command discipline in the disclaimers problem may result from this work order, in that the omissions will be so obvious as to underline the problem.

4. So far in this note I have not been responsive to the fundamental question and the last one you put -- that of avoiding waste motion at the working level. I am not sure that this isn't inherent in the way that this Agency works; I am also not sure that this is wrong. If we were to find some programming partly completed and then suspend action, the time is not necessarily all wasted, for if the suspended project is later reinstated, presumably we could pick up where we left off. On the other hand, there is no point in surfacing for policy approval the many ideas and proposals generated at the working level before we have at least determined that they would be feasible should policy approval be forthcoming. Requests for approval almost always need some spelling out of detail in order that the approving authority may know what he is being asked to approve, and the detail is usually developed at the working level. Presumably when your total management information system is structured and in operation, you or part of your Working Group will become a monitoring body on changes to it; in effect, providing that review which you discuss in your present paper. I suspect that until then the natural process of backlogging or queuing will provide a certain policing.



Deputy Director of Personnel

25X1